

process. What the Chizek amendment does not do is wipe away what is the essence of LB 355 and that is the cooling off period. The cooling off period is what distinguishes LB 355 from LB 801 and any other NRA sponsored bill. What has been the NRA response to the overwhelming desire of Nebraskans for waiting periods for the purchase of handguns? The NRA's response last year was any restriction on the purchase of handguns was unacceptable. It violates the Constitution, said the NRA, and they cried it all over the state, it violates the Constitution of our state and of the United States Constitution. This year, however, the NRA proposes restrictions on the purchase of handguns. But the NRA restriction isn't violative of the Constitution, because it's the NRA restriction. Only LB 355, because it was not their idea, violates the Constitution. It is coincidental that as the Brady bill proceeds through Congress the NRA knows it must get something in place or the seven-day waiting period will be enacted in Nebraska. Senator Schellpeper said at the hearing LB 801 is too expensive. Supporters of LB 801 have told Senator Schellpeper, as has been reported in the press, they do not support any gun control. Then why are they supporting LB 801? LB 801 is nothing more than an effort to stop LB 355 and the Brady bill. I suggest to you that if LB 355 had required a purchaser of a handgun to walk around the block before the purchase of a handgun, the NRA would be against it. The NRA has over 20,000 members in Nebraska and I think...I think we have all probably heard from every single one of them. It doesn't want its members to be inconvenienced. That's the issue. The National Rifle Association does not want its members inconvenienced. Now I have a burden. I must persuade you that it is bad public policy to allow an emotionally disturbed person to purchase a handgun over the counter without a check or any cooling off period whatsoever. Let me put it this way. If I cannot persuade you that LB 355 will not save the life of one Nebraskan, vote no. But if I can persuade you that the saving of life is a natural consequence of this bill, then vote yes. I suggest to you that you look beyond the first duty of life, as Wilde put it, to strike a pose and to do what's right. Now let's listen to the voices of Nebraska. Let me cite some examples where we could have saved a life or prevented a tragedy. If you may not have in front of you, but yesterday I set out a packet of information about examples of how a cooling off period, a waiting period could have saved a life of a child or a woman and man in Nebraska. In Hastings, in 1987, a 36-year-old wife and mother purchased a handgun in a local